DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 902 HE 005 521

AUTHOR Blackburn, Robert T.; King, James
TITLE Professorial Values: Yesterday and Today.
PUB DATE [74]
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (59th, Chicago, Illinois, April 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Group Norms; *Higher Education; Research Projects; *Social Values; *Teacher Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Questions regarding changing professorial values are examined from three sources and methodologies--historical, sociological, and humanistic. Each approach contributes to an answer to the issue although each method has limitations. (The historical record is spotty. Socioeconomic status and religious background data are cross-sectional, not longitudinal. The novel selects and distorts reality, as is its right.) Nonetheless, the three methods support and reinforce one another and give confidence to the generalizations. Findings show persons entering the professoriate to continue to come from favored classes. Faculty from Jewish backgrounds hold posts far in excess of the national proportions, those from Catholic upbringing are increasing appreciably, and those from Protestant homes are steadily declining. Apostasy rates show all groups are alike. In all, the best judgment is that basic professorial values are not changing in significant ways. (Author)

AERA 9.05

HE

ED 090902

PROFESSORIAL VALUES: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Robert T. Blackburn
Professor of Higher Education
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor

James King, Chairman
Division of Humanities
Hillsdale College
Hillsdale, Michigan

HE 005 521

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

PROFESSORIAL VALUES: YESTERDAY AND TODAY

Robert T. Blackburn (University of Michigan) and

James B. King (Hillsdale College)

Questions regarding changing professorial values are examined from three sources and methodologies--historical, sociological, and humanistic. Each approach contributes to an answer to the issue although each method has limitations. (The historical record is spotty. Socio-economic status and religious background data are cross sectional, not longitudinal. The novel selects and distorts reality, as is its right.) Nonetheless, the three methods support and reinforce one another and give confidence to the generalizations. Findings show persons entering the professoriate to continue to come from favored classes. Faculty from Jewish backgrounds hold posts far in excess of the national proportions, those from Catholic upbringing are increasing appreciably, and those from Protestant homes are steadily declining. Apostasy rates show all groups are alike. In all, the best judgment is that basic professorial values are not changing in significant ways.

INTRODUCTION

Several factors combine to make the question of whether or not basic faculty values have changed recently an important question. First of all, in the past ten years the number of faculty have more than doubled. More than one-third of a million people became professors in less than a decade, a phenomenon of outstanding social consequences all by itself. That recruitment tapped heretofore untouched resources seems inevitable. Have new faculty acquired the tried norms of the profession or are they injecting a new set of values in academe? Is the much heralded new breed of faculty really different or just more numerous and more vocal? Said another way, are the current storms surrounding faculty part of the normal weather cycle or has a major climatic change taken place?

Second, a new wave of attacks have been launched against professors. Simultaneously faculty are said to neglect teaching but be guilty of organizing teach-ins, to overemphasize applied research but to ignore social problems, to not interact with young adults yet be responsible for spawning student demonstrations, to discriminate in favor of an elite meritocracy but be lowering standards because of misplaced egalitarian concerns, to remain dispassionate social critics but to come down from ivied towers and engage with the real world. While many of these charges have been leveled once or more in the past, each implies a fundamental academic value change has taken place.

The answer naturally is sought in the historical record and from data on faculty origins as sociologically determined. Since both these approaches had equivocal results, academic novels are used as a third perspective on changing faculty values. The principal findings are presented in successive sections. A brief discussion on the implications concludes the analysis.

The Historical Record

Most higher educational histories fall into one of three kinds. Two categories are relatively pure--histories of institutions and histories of individuals, usually presidents. The third tends to address topics in higher education such as liberal education, athletics, the education of women, academic freedom, and graduate education.

Surprisingly, however, no history takes the professor as its central focus. Institutional histories often include brief passages about selected faculty, distinguished scholars who confer prestige on the college. Frequently the president was a professor at one stage in his career but only a small portion of the history (biographical or otherwise) will describe that interlude.

Even higher education's general histories avoid all but an oblique consideration of the professor. Earnest (1953) allocates two pages of undocumented and questionable assertions. Hofstadter and Wilson (1962) reproduce abbreviated excerpts, principally from presidents. Rudolph (1962) devotes a chapter, but the contents focus chiefly on the rise of the practice of academic rank, specialization by advanced training and organization (departmentalism), the research role in the production of knowledge, and the issue of academic freedom. Brubacher and Rudy (1968) similarly confine their treatment of academics to the matter of academic freedom and participation in university governance. Veysey (1966) gives more space to faculty, but he treats a comparatively short interval and relies on the remarks of only a few famous individuals in select environments, a sample hardly representative of the typical professor at the turn of the century.

Why histories fall short with respect to faculty is not immediately clear. Perhaps it has been assumed by academic scholars that they know themselves so well that writing about their peers would be either so trite as to be valueless or so narcisstic as to violate good taste. More likely, though, the neglect stems from the absence of evidence, the lack of documents that might give insights into the basic nature of academic people.

Two dissertations provide some information about the professor in earlier periods. Kennedy (1961) demonstrates faculty role changes between 1800 and 1870. She argues that the professor's primary allegiance has changed from the institution to a department, that they are now (1870) scientific scholars with professional status rather than dilettante teachers without, and that as lay rather than clergy their role with respect to students is more of a benevolent parent surrogate than an institutionally appointed despot. In addition, their classroom functions now have them administrating written rather than oral examinations and lecturing from a variety of sources as specialists rather than drilling within a single text in the classical sense.

Allen (1962) contrasts faculty roles at the turn of the century with those of 1960. His sociological inquiry depends heavily upon the highbrow literature circa 1900 and upon Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) for the contemporary period. Allen finds few differences at the two points in time with respect to attitudes about teaching, research, and service, and the effort expended on each. The unstated inference is that there has been no significant change in the professorial role during the period and/or that today's recruits to the profession hold similar values.

As Metzger (1973) explores tenure (faculty job security) historically, he finds three distinctive faculty stages. Earliest America inherited the English model and the professor as a master, a privileged occupation with tenure with one of its adjuncts. But the strength of faculty quickly fell as control moved to church and state. Professors were reduced to an employee status and security, while it accrued with time on the job, ultimately depended upon "proper" behavior in the nonacademic eyes of presidents and trustees. The third stage, the current one which links tenure to academic freedom, emerged with the rise of professionalism (societies, scholarhips, et al) around 1900 and has continuously developed since then.

While Metzger's last stage spans this century and hence suggests no fundamental change in professorial values, the nature of the work contract may not be a critical matter in affecting academic values. For example, Blau (1973) shows the size of colleges and universities affects administrator-faculty ratios. And since growth has been phenomenal, faculty relationships can be expected to be different now from what they were when bureaucracies were essentially non-existent, say, in 1900. Ben-David (1971) while not directly addressing the faculty value question, sees the size, and hence the explosive growth, of the United States system of higher education as its most distinctive feature. From his vantage point outside the United States and from his comparative studies, the inference would be like Blau's and different from Metzger's. Life in academe is different today from what it was yesterday.

In addition, the historical inquiries raise questions that are not answered in the investigations. For example, Kennedy's history does not indicate whether there now exists fundamentally the same person performing different functions or a very different individual performing new ones because the changed role attracted a recruit cut from a new cloth? Is he a layman who might have become a minister? Or is he selected through a socialization process quite alien, even antithetical, to the clerical?

Allen's conclusion suffers from similar limitations. His 1900 data from the Atlantic Monthly, Nation, and Scribners reflect a Bliss Perry view, how faculty life is lived at Williams, Princeton, Harvard, and abroad, not the church related colleges of the south and land grant universities of the midwest. Riesman's serpentine was more true then than now. Today the snake can be touched anywhere, not just at the head, and nearly simultaneous responses set all members in motion.[1] What Allen may have found is that

---

[1]American colleges and universities are still stratified, but the differences between strata are more in the abilities of their clientele and the nature of their staff than in their functions.

---

what was true for a very few in 1900 is now true for many in the 1970's.

Other dimensions of higher education have changed appreciably in the past 60 to 70 years--the nature of a liberal education, the practice of academic freedom, and the political and public role of the professor—to mention but a few salient transformations. Certainly explosive growth alone suggests a recruitment of persons into the profession from heretofore relatively untapped groves.[2]

[2]A few 20th century studies on professors from the 1930's and 40's provide partial benchmarks for a connection to a not too distant past. Wilson's (1942) is the more comprehensive. (Wilson (1965) has since stated he sees little change over the past 25 years.) It is, however, sociological, not historical, a snap shot without a time dimension. Bowman (1938) and Shryrock (1959) have data on a more restricted population of academic men but cannot answer the questions of change.

The historical record, then, is hazy and far from conclusive. Changes in faculty activities and in numbers may or may not signal a new set of values. What sometimes had the ferocity of the tornado might really have been nothing more than an unforecast and momentary shift in the prevailing westerlies. We need to look elsewhere to see if a new age has arrived.

Family Background

Family backgrounds provide a second way in which the question of changing faculty values can be approached. Parent's socio-economic status (SES) and religion raised have been demonstrated to predict adult values. (See, e.g., Lenski (1961) on religion and voting behavior.) If it can be shown that today's faculty have been drawn from new societal pools, then the case for new academic values is strengthened, and conversely.

As can be seen from Table 1, several inquiries have collected data on father's occupation, one measure of SES. However, no investigator reports

[Insert Table 1 about here.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1: Faculty Father's Occupation: Collected Studies, in Percent

Male (Father's) Occupation	U.S. Population, 1800 (Estimated)	Carrell (1968) All colleges, 1800	U.S. Population, 1930	Ballou (1933) Teachers Colleges	Ballou (1933) Liberal Arts Colleges	Kunkel (1937) AAUP Sample	U.S. Population, 1940	Stecklein & Eckert (1958) Minn.-Public & Private Colleges & Universities (CUs)	Lazarsfeld & Thielens (1958) National Sample-Social Scientists	Gustad (1960) South: Chem, Eng.& Psych	McKinney (1963) South	Donovan (1964) Male Catholics in Male & Coed CUs	U.S. Population, 1965	Bullock (1967) Midwest State U.	ACE-Carnegie (1968) National Sample
Professions	2	19	4	19	39	36	6	23	31	57	27	11	12	31	25
Business & Managerial	6	22	10	22	34	27	10	29	40		25	22	14	17	36
Sub-Total: Professions and Business	8	41	14	41	73	63	16	52	71	57	52	33	26	48	61
Agriculture	85	39	22	39	9	25	15		13	13		8	5	5	9
All others (blue and white collar)	7	20	62	20	17	12	69	42	15	30	47	57	69	46	29
Unknown	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
Totals (N, when known)	100 --	100 (200) (210)	100 ---	100 (623)	99* (516)	100 (41.5% Members	100 ---	100 (706)	99* (2541)	100 (1665)	99* (393)	100 (	100 ---	99* (97)	99* (60,447)

Notes:

1) Wilson (1942: 18-19) says there is "great upward mobility," but he gives no data.
2) Berelson (1960:134) says less than 50% of doctoral recipients are from professional, managerial, and propietary classes and that less than 6% have fathers who are professors. He gives no further breakdown.
3) Visher (1947), Roe (1952), Clark (1957), and Perkins (1962) discuss the topic but give no data. Of passing interest is that of the 64 scientists Roe has followed, the nine who are professors have fathers who are professors.

*From rounding

either longitudinal or cross sectional data of father's occupation when faculty were children. That is, the studies give figures for all faculty, never for younger vs. older, the data required to see if changes over time have taken place. Displaying the study findings in a chronological manner and interspersing United States census data so as to allow for the nation's changing occupational structure made possible some inferences with respect to the central question.

First, however, the Table has several obvious limitations. No two studies used identical SES categories and hence detailed comparisons are precluded. In order to detect any trends it was necessary to combine occupational groups into more general categories. Combining submerges some distinctions--between unskilled, semiskilled, skilled (blue collar), and white collar, for example. However, since the preponderance of faculty have come from the professional, managerial, and business sectors (these are subtotaled in Table 1), less information is lost than first meets the eye.

Second, the populations are never identical at different points in time. Only two are national samples (Lazarsfeld and Thielens, 1958; ACE-Carnegie, 1968) and one of these is restricted to a single discipline, social science faculty. The difference by kind of institution is seen clearly in Ballou's two populations, private liberal arts colleges and teachers colleges.[3]

---

[3]Geographical location is important, as will be seen in Table 2 below. The South does not have Catholics or Jews in anywhere near the national ratios (See Gustad, 1960). Academic discipline also matters, especially with regard to religion (see the Chronicle, 1970).

Third, the gap from Carrell's (1968) historical search in 1800 until 1935 is gigantic and needs no further comment. Fortunately, however, the growth of the system and the total numbers effected during that long period of time are incremental. The revolutionary expansion begins in 1945. Hence this unfortunate loss is not as critical as it initially appears. The studies from 1930 on cover this important period.

Still, a word of caution is required. The data are displayed as if they were chronological, that is, as if one faculty cohort were followed over a career. In reality, though, the data are cross-sectional, not longitudinal. To infer trends, say, for example, a rise in the proportion of faculty from agricultural backgrounds, assumes farm youth have equal access to academic positions, an assumption which needs to be questioned in light of the religious data of Table 2 below.[4] Also, the cross-sectional method assumes equal holding power within the profession, i.e., that those who entered from one SES or religious (cultural) group are as likely to stay (and succeed and/or leave) as are entrants from any other category. This assumption is likewise untested.[5]

---

[4]The assumption of equal access is clearly violated with respect to minority groups and increasing evidence refutes the premise with respect to women. Yet the cross-sectional approach remains valuable. The population under examination is overwhelmingly white males. The question remains: Are the SES and religious backgrounds from which faculty are coming changing over time?

---

[5]It might be expected to be valid for some disciplines. For example, alternative careers for Ph.D.'s in philosophy are few. Ph.D.'s in chemistry, however, have had several choices available even at advanced ages.

Turning to childhood religious practices provides a second measure of changed basic values. Table 2, like Table 1, collects the studies which have the relevant data. Table 2 also makes the same assumptions with respect to equal access and holding power. In fact, to infer religious discrimination in the past--as Lipset and Ladd (1971) and Greeley (1973) have done--asserts that the first assumption of equal access if false. Simultaneously, their arguments tacitly assume that holding power is independent of religion raised. That is, those of all religious backgrounds are equally likely to remain academics.

[Insert Table 2 about here.]

Table 2 has the same limitations as Table 1. Location and kind of college, for example, matter greatly and the lack of similar populations limits comparisons. Also, the figures are confounded by some studies reporting childhood religion and other current beliefs. Since apostasy is extraordinarily high among academics (Zelan, 1969), inferences regarding present from past practices require adjustment. (See Table 3 below.)

Also, Table 2 does not have U.S. total population data at different times. Records are lacking, ways of counting church membership vary by denomination, and national rises and falls complicate analyses. A "safe" breakdown for the recent period would be that, without respect to a formalness and/or intensity of religious commitment, about 65% of U.S. families are Protestant, 25% Catholic, 3% Jewish, 3-4% all others, and 3-4% have an intentional "None."

Yet despite all the qualifications that must be attached to generalizations made, many inferences emerge from this data. Only those bearing most directly on the central question of faculty origins as they relate to the values today's professors hold are discussed.[6]

TABLE 2. Faculty Religion (Raised R or Present P, as Noted): Collected Studies, in Percents

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Religion	Veysey (1965) University of Chicago, 1893	Gallup Poll, 1955 Religious Preference	Lazarsfeld and Thielens (1958) National-Social Scientists	Gustad (1960: 16)	South: Chem, Eng, Psych	Thalheimer (1963) UCLA Faculty	Donovan (1964: 55) Males at Catholic Coed & Male CUs	U.S. Estimated	Barlow (1966) United Presby Cs	King (1968) Bible Colleges	King (1968) LAC, Church of Christ	Parsons & Platt (1968)		ACE-Carnegie, 1968				Henlein & Blackburn (1971) Catholic Colleges & Universities
														Faculty 60 and over	All Faculty		Faculty 30 and under	
	P	P	P	R	P	P	R	P	P	P	P	R	P	R	R	P	R	P
Protestant	94	71	67	82	76	38	a	65	71	99[c]	96[d]	57	31	77	65	47	58	11
Catholic	0	23	12	6		9	95	25	7	0	0	13	9	12	15	13	22	81
Jew	3	3	4	3	8	7	a	3	1	0	0	19	10	7	11	8	12	1
Other	3	a	2	5		a	a	3	10[b]	1[c]	4	--	--	2	4	7	4	0
None	0	4	13	0	15	46	a	4	12	0	0	11	50	3	4	26	3	7
Unknown (unascertained; no response	0*	a	1	4	0	a	a	0		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals (N's, when known)	100 (119)	101**	99** (2451)	100 (1665)	99**	100 (741)	(267)	100	101** (257)	100 (96)	100 (443)	100 (420)	100	101**	99** (8675)	101**	99**	100 (509)

*10% were unknown and these have been dropped and the %s calculated on the remaining
**From rounding

a = Not reported
b = Includes Agnostics
c = Christian Church. Presumably 1% "Other" is also Protestant
d = 88% in Church of Christ, 8% from Christian Church. "Other" like "C" above.

[6]Blackburn and Booth (1974) and Booth and Blackburn (1974) have papers in preparation which give detailed and extended analyses of the ACE-Carnegie data with respect to faculty SES and religious backgrounds.

1. Upper SES groups have dominated and continue to be the principal supplier of U.S. faculty. An indication that the professional and managerial classes are diminishing in their contribution to the professoriate is misleading. True, there is a factor of five (41 to 8: Table 1) in 1800, but the population is small, agriculture overrides all else, and it is one moment in time. During the 1930's, the three studies (Ballou; Ballou; Kunkel) are each atypical--teachers college vs. selective liberal arts colleges vs. the unrepresentativeness of AAUP membership. The teacher college faculty no doubt is below the mean whereas the other two sources certainly represent above average SES. Perhaps 4 to 1 is the best estimate of the ratio of faculty supplied from upper SES as compared to the total U.S. population.

By the 1940's and '50's, the ratio is about 3 to 1 (54% to 18%), the social science discipline being quite different (see below). Today (ACE-Carnegie, 1968), the figure is 2 1/2 to 1 (61% to 26%). At first glance, the figures indicate a long range trend away from upper SES. However, the above analysis is deceptive. The ratio goes down because the national proportion of these two SES groups is rising very dramatically the past three decades. It took 140 years to double, from 8% in 1800 to 16% in 1940. In the past 25 years, the upper SES level has nearly doubled again. The 61% of faculty from advantaged SES today is more than the 41% in 1800, the 50 odd percent in the 1930's, and the slightly less than 60% in the 1940 to 1965 period. Upper SES continues as the primary source of faculty supply.[7]

[7]Also, the 61% from ACE-Carnegie, the highest ever, includes faculty in community colleges as 15% of the sample, the first time this group becomes an appreciable percentage of the total U.S. faculty. Community college professors reflect upward social mobility and hence they statistically suppress the 61% figure. When community college faculty are removed from the sample, upper SES is even higher.

However, a few shifts merit attention. Even though the percentage of the U.S. population now classified as professional had had its first really marked increase in the past twenty-five years (whereas the percentage in business and management have gained much less), the professions are contributing a decreasing proportional share and the managerial occupations are supplying an increasing percentage share. In fact, the loss from the professions is equaled, or even slightly exceeded, by the gain from business and management.[8]

[8]It is of some interest to note that faculty spawn faculty at a rate considerably less than the medical and legal professions, 5% versus over 15% (Berelson, 1960: 134). Moreover, a recent pilot investigation at The University of Michigan revealed that 30% of the faculty's wives had fathers who were professors. Were that figure to be true on an extended basis, the psychological implications for faculty values could be quite startling.

The slight increase of faculty from agricultural homes may be explained by the fact that the farms that are left today are large, often rich, and may be no different from business and management. Blue and white collar workers remain about constant in the U.S. population. The gain in the professions and managerial groups is being offset by the migration from rural to urban

settings. Still the faculty from lower SES remain less than one-third and may even be decreasing.

The one notable exception may be Catholics. See the Donovan (1964) entry. While Donovan's N is small, it is a random sample of male faculty in coeducational and men's Catholic colleges and universities. Here the immigrant is very visible. Only 33% versus 61% are from upper SES, and 57% versus 29% from the working class, both a 2 to 1 differential. That the fraction of the U.S. population in Catholic colleges and universities is small is true, but the percentage and member of faculty raised as Catholics is increasing steadily.

In balance, then, and with exceptions noted, faculty continue to be drawn primarily from the same, advantaged families that they were in the past. To the extent that enduring values are formed in the home, major changes are not expected.

2. Religion likewise presents complexities as a predictor of present faculty values. Some factors, however, are fairly clear and serve as a point of departure. First, the WASP syndrome, while still dominant, has been undergoing a steady erosion which shows no signs of abating. The ACE-Carnegie data show a decline from 77% Protestants over 60 to 59% under 30, a fall of 18% and to a figure less than the U.S. proportion of 65%.

At the same time, Jews represent over 12%, a figure 400% above their proportion in the total population. The percent has increased from six percent (over 60), but is nearly constant for the past three decades. In a rapidly expanding system the near constant percentage means the absolute numbers have increased appreciably. In fact, when the number of faculty doubled, so did the number of faculty raised in Jewish families yet the absolute number of Jews in the total population increased only slightly (Blackburn and Booth, 1974).

Of no less consequence is the steady rise in the percentage of faculty from Catholic origins, from around 11% forty years ago (over 60) to nearly 21% today (under 30), almost a doubling and almost achieving a percentage reflecting the national population (25%). Greeley (1973) calls special attention to the magnitude of this social phenomenon.[9]

---

[9]The distribution of Catholics, Jews, and Protestants is by no means random throughout the system of higher education. Great differences exist between disciplines (e.g., faculty from Jewish homes range from under 2% in nursing to over 20% in medicine) and by institutional type (e.g., again taking faculty from Jewish homes, about 26% are in the most highly selective universities as contrasted with less than 5% in community colleges).

The inference from the religious data is that today's faculty have been recruited from distinctive, new pools and hence can be expected to introduce a new set of values. However, other religious data lead to the opposite conclusion.

Table 3 gives the figures on religion raised versus present religion for the total sample and for one sub-group, those 30 and under at the highly selective universities and colleges. The high apostasy rates (U.S. population is about 3%) are much the same for Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The more

[Insert Table 3 about here.]

selective the institution the higher the apostasy rate and the younger faculty--supposing they represent the "new breed"--accentuate the rate even more, up to 50% in fact. Higher education itself--the academic discipline and the college--is the new religion (Zelan, 1968), and this is as true for the Catholic as it is for the Jew or Protestant. The Catholics, who above looked

TABLE 3

Apostasy, in Percent, by Religion Raised: From ACE-Carnegie Data

Religion	All Faculty	Faculty Under 31 in Selective CUs
Protestant	-28%*	-54%*
Catholic	-24	-46
Jewish	-32	-38

*Note: These are minimum losses for the percents are calculated from Present Religion (P) and Religion Raised (R) data by the formula of $\frac{R-P}{R} \times 100$. P includes converts, who, while seldom exceeding 1% are interesting cases. Hence P is larger than it would be if only those keeping their religion raised were considered. The principal exception is in the lower selective colleges. Here, there is an appreciable conversion to Roman Catholocism in older age cohorts. In fact, there are some instances when the percentages are negative, that is, P>R, the only reversals that exist. Presumably these are Catholic colleges.

like the one group who showed the most definite signs of upward social mobility and the tapping of a lower SES group in significant numbers, have essentially shed their early garb and taken on the mantle of the new church. They have been socialized in the process of joining and differ not at all from those already there.

In summary, then, while this sociological approach to the question of whether or not new values have been introduced in the explosive expansion of the professoriate has uncovered many interesting changes in sub-groups of the population, little support can be generated for major changes in what a professor is like. In fact, the preponderance of the data suggest that the system has mostly absorbed greater numbers and only slightly increased its diversity and, in the latter case, acted on it to give to the new the long standing values of the oligarchy.[10]

---

[10]Whether the shedding of childhood religion values occurred before selection of the academic life remains debatable (Zelan, 1968). Thalheimer's (1973) limited evidence suggests it occurs before joining a faculty. However, even if the transformation took place in undergraduate or graduate school, i.e., before official faculty appointment, it still represents the strong socializing effect of the higher educational institutions.

The Academic Novel

To what extent, then, have faculty values undergone change? While the scarcity of historical records and the equivocal nature of the sociological data make it difficult to provide a definite answer, other sociological

studies have established the validity of fiction as a purveyor of truth and hence suggest the academic novel as a reliable guide to actual faculty attitudes and behavior (Inglis, 1938; Trilling, 1950; Millgate, 1964).

No one academic novel by itself can provide the kind of data needed. Nor can a single professorial character be regarded as typical of the professoriate at any point of time or in any institution; Mary McCarthy's Henry Mulcahy should not be regarded as representative of college teachers any more than Babbit should be of the American businessman. Yet, as several recent studies have shown, a study of numerous academic novels representative of various historical periods and institutions can result in a compliation of characteristics of institutions, professors, and students that correlates with the available historical data (Lyons, 1962; Belok, 1968; King, 1970).

The approach here follows King (1970). In order to discern the characteristics of the professor's personal and professional image in fiction, a series of questions was applied to each fictional professor character. These questions included references to such things as his economic and marital status, favorable and unfavorable personality traits, non-academic interests and concerns, professional training, responsiblities, and conflicts, and relationships with students, colleagues, and administrators. The characteristics that emerged from the fictional investigation were then compared with those in the available nonfictional studies. In addition to numerous works on various aspects of the professor's life and responsibilities, biographies and histories of higher education were employed.

It was discovered that while the college novel does not consistently reflect the actual image of the college professor, it does mirror certain typical notions of the professor and attitudes toward the intellectual in American society.

In the college novel, the image of the professor is distorted primarily by selectivity. Yet when a novel is a good novel it is so because it rings true. It depicts life as it is. Furthermore, the characters acquire much more than the skeleton achieved from sociological questionnaires. The novel deals with the humaness of the academic man and thereby supplies answers to the basic questions not only for yesterday but also for today. The genre of the novel provides a kind of truth and a degree of truth that heretofore largely have been ignored in writing on faculty.

A study of the fictive professor reveals certain recurring favorable and unfavorable personality traits which are responsible for creating certain images of the professor. Most of the characteristics for which the fictional professor is praised or criticized remain relatively constant over the years. Foremost among these enduring traits are idealism, a propensity for interpersonal and institutional conflict, alienation, and drive/ambition/hard work--all of this mixed with a lack of masculinity in the male and the lack of feminity in the woman.

An examination of three academic novels--Arthur Pier's The Pedagogues (1899), Robert Herrick's Chimes (1925), and Mary McCarthy's The Groves of Academe (1951)--illustrates the enduring professional traits that emerge from King's study of thirty novels. These three representative novels effectively depict the periods in which they were written.

Idealism is perhaps the most dominant professorial trait. In the nineteenth century novel it is reflected in the professor's dedication to his students and to his institution whereas in this century it is manifested in his political liberalism. The college professor's political idealism does not emerge in the nineteenth century novel, probably because primarily students and former students rather than professors wrote these earliest academic novels

and because then the academic community less frequently acted as a politicized entity. Moreover, faculty idealism, mixes heavily with naiveté. Professors are "liberals," but their actions, when they engage more than verbally, are bungling and ineffective.

Alfred Palatine, in Pier's The Pedagogues, illustrates idealism that characterizes the nineteenth century professor. Totally dedicated to the art of teaching, Palatine's goal is no less than the transformation of his students' intellectual and personal lives. The youthful Palatine's naiveté, like that of most of his twentieth century counterparts, yet unlike many of his older conterporaries, leads to difficulties. He "invited friendship, intimacy, and unblossomings" because "he felt that by such methods he could do his pupils the most good, while deriving the most from them." Consequently he becomes embroiled in the personal lives of his students--in several inextricable entanglements that leave him sorrowful and scarred. By the end of the novel, his idealism is tempered and he has developed affectations and manners that render him aloof.

While there are instances where twentieth century fictional professors are dedicated to students and institutions, most are involved in larger issues and causes. During World War I, Clavercin and many of the other faculty members in Chimes take strong stands on controversial issues. Their defense of pacificism and German culture is wasted upon the business-oriented Board of Trustees. One of Herrick's characters, a Professor Hardy who has seen the best and the worst of both worlds as political science professor, cabinet officer, and bombadier, speaks not only to his faculty colleagues but to all fictional professors when he says: "The trouble with you fellows in the university is that you won't accept the world as it is. You are all idealists at heart and this is a realistic world (185-186)."

McCarthy satirizes the tendency of college professors to become involved in liberal causes even when they do not have all the facts. When her Professor Mulcahy is dismissed, he employs trickery and falsehood to dupe the liberals and idealists into joining his cause. Even though he is a weak instructor, Mulcahy's colleagues support him, only to suffer embarrassment when the truth is revealed.

A second characteristic of the fictional professor is that he is usually enmeshed in conflict with students, colleagues, and administrators. Generally these conflicts occur because he champions a particular educational philosophy or method that is not readily embraced by the others. In the earlier (and frequent student authored) novels, the conflicts are between students and professors. Most of these conflicts emanate from either the professor's pedagogical technique or from his attempt to monitor his students' moral behavior outside of the classroom. As the protagonist in The Pedagogues, Palatine's new affected classroom manner makes him less accessible than he had previously been. He, however, is not subjected to the cruel pranks and parodies which the students impose upon another teacher, George Gorch, who is considered irrelevant and boring.

In all ages, conflicts with students emerge when the students sense that the professor is dull,not relevant. Clavercin has a reputation for being aloof and conceited. As a result many students offended by his manner boycotted his classes. Similarly, Mulcahy's students frequently complained about his ineffectiveness as a teacher.

In the early part of the twentieth century professional conflicts develop with colleagues and administrators. Rivalries and back-biting occur for many reasons. Younger professors clash with older professors over ideas and methods. Clavercin encounters hostility from his colleagues because of his eastern background. His Ivy League education and attitudes put him on the defensive with

peers from differing educational backgrounds. In addition, frequently professors are envious of the achievements and attainments of their colleagues. When Clavercin's play proves to be an embarrassment to the college, "his enemies and underlings in his own department who envied him, his position, and hoped to advance on his ruin, exultantly awaited 'the end of Clavercin and the Harvard idea' as they put it."

Administrative clashes result from the increasing specialization and restructuring of the universities, their more sophisticated departmental organization, and the increased faculty participation in the governance of the institution. Difference of opinion as to the value of certain educational innovations, the performance of various administrators, and the direction of the institutions led to academic politicking and backbiting. Herrick (1925) portrays these conflicts vividly in Chimes. He reports the faculty meetings where participants "beat themselves to feeble passions over trivial differences" and struggles ensue between professors intent upon preserving the integrity of their courses and administrators who are equally intent upon extending and democraticizing higher education.

Academic freedom issues cause disruptive conflicts. The most celebrated fictional treatment of this theme occurs in McCarthy's Groves of Academe where Mulcahy divides his campus into warring factions when he starts the rumor that his dismissal occurred because of a Communist Party membership early in his career.

Psychological alienation, a third enduring trait, stems from the professor's estrangement from the real world. Perhaps this trait is rooted in the solitude and contemplative nature of the scholarly life or perhaps it emanates from the professor's inability to reconcile his ideal vision with the practical, everyday world. The fictional professor almost always is

alienated from the larger society and frequently (particularly in modern fiction) even from himself.

Pier's Palatine enjoys the ascetic life. Even though he is comfortable socializing with students and readily accepts invitations to teas and dances, he declares that such things as marriage are not for him. Such activities interfere with the discipline of the scholarly life. The psychological alienation of Professors Clavercin and Mulcahy is more pronounced and much more complex. Both professors have difficulty relating not only to the outside world but to their students, colleagues, and wives as well. Neither is happy with society, nor is either happy with his present situation. Each takes out his frustrations on those about him.

Still another deep seated characteristic is the professorial propensity for hard work. The vast majority of fictional professors are ambitious people who labor industriously. Whereas the nineteenth century academic man expends his energy primarily on activities associated with teaching, the twentieth century instructor devotes more time to departmental and faculty politics and to outside activities. In both cases the teachers seem motivated by a desire to be liked and respected by students as well as by colleagues and by a concern for professional security.

One reason why Palatine is initially so populaf with his students results from his dedication to teaching. He spends hours writing copious comments on students' themes, conferring with students on academic and personal concerns, and studying to prepare his lectures. A neophyte instructor, Palatine works hard to earn the respect of his older colleagues. Clavercin also drives himself even though by doing so he frequently earns the disfavor of his students and colleagues. He spends innumerable hours dissecting student papers, writing verse and plays, and championing classical education. Likewise, Henry Mulcahy

is an ambitious and industrious man--albiet his efforts are directed toward fostering the gossip that will help preserve his professorial position.

A fifth enduring trait is the lack of masculinity in males and a lack of femininity in women members of the professoriate. Intellectual activities unsex professors. This characteristic of the male professor probably stems from the complementary notions that the professor is unable to cope with the everyday, practical world and that he is socially inadequate. The married professors usually have dominant wives who make the practical decisions. Palatine, who unlike many of his counterparts engages in golf, is described as having affectations and manners that are rather effeminate. Associated with Clavercin are all of the unmasculine qualities that are usually attributed to a creative writer. McCarthy describes her Professor Mulcahy as "a tall, soft-bellied, lisping man with a tense, mushroom white face...."

Fiction stereotypes the female professor even more. She is generally depicted as being unmarried, unattractive, and dedicated to her work. She appears to be aggressive, dominant, hard working, sympathetic, and idealistic. When she is physically attractive, she is cold and emotionally unstable with the opposite sex. While there are no female professors in The Pedagogues, other nineteenth century novels abound with examples. For instance, Miss Arbuthnot, in Goodloe's College Girls (1895), is a lonely, dedicated scholar who lives in monastic seculsion. Her room is totally devoid of feminine paraphernalia. Herrick provides two outstanding examples: (1) Mrs. Edith Crandall, a widow, who is described as having a "man's grasp of the actual," and (2) Miss Jessica Stowe, who eventually marries but then deserts her family in order to pursue clinical research in psychology. Domna Regnev, a physically attractive woman teacher in Groves of Academe, attempts to hide her emotional instability through dedication to her work.

These same five deeply imbedded professorial traits can be found in most other novels. Furthermore, academic novels suggest that these traits have persisted over a period of time and continue up to the present.

Discussion

A deep persistence overrides storms of the moment. Apparent drastic shifts are really momentary perturbations exaggerated and misjudged by the societal pressures of the day--a war, political corruption, a national malaise. Today's crisis has us infer that fundamental value changes have occurred, even when they have not.

So also seems to be the case with academics. On more than one occasion our attention has been called to the "new breed" of faculty. The three analyses conducted here find that fundamental faculty values have remained remarkably stable over an extended period of time.

Two immediate consequences follow from this overriding conclusion. One is practical; the other is theoretical.

As for the practical, some good news, bad news inferences can be made. As for the good news, the persistence and solid base of our colleges and universities give us confidence that they will be able to continue to weather misfortunes and maintain a true course. Deepseated characteristics also mean that the influx of women and blacks as academics should proceed with minimal problems, a most important consequent.

As for the practical bad news, it is not new news. Change will continue to be difficult to effect in our higher educational institution, even when it should take place.

Lastly, that the historical, sociological, and humanistic methodologies reinforced one another in this study opens doors for further research on the academic profession. Confidence in results obtained from any one methodological approach

is now enhanced and can be used to support inferences drawn from the other two. This outcome is also an important one for research on faculty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Donald F.

1962 "Changes in the Role of the American University Professor." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Texas.

American Council on Education - Carnegie Commission

1968 Unpublished Tape Data From Faculty Questionnaire.

Ballou, Willard A.

1933 "A Comparative Study of State Teachers College Faculties and Liberal Arts College Faculties." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Barlow, Lynwood L.

1966 "Faculty Selection in Colleges Related to the United Presbyterian Church." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University.

Belok, Michael

1968 "The College Professor in the Novel, 1940-1957." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Southern California.

Ben-David, Joseph

1971 American Higher Education: Directions Old and New. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Berelson, Bernard

1960 Graduate Education in the United States. McGraw-Hill: New York.

Blackburn, Robert T. and David B. Booth

1974 "Religious Ethnicity and Faculty Careers". Submitted for publication.

Blau, Peter M.

1973 The Organization of Academic Work. New York: Wiley.

Booth, David B. and Robert T. Blackburn

1974 "Social-Economic Mobility and the Faculty Career. Submitted for publication.

Bowman, Claude C.

1938 The College Professor in America. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy

1968 Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row.

Bullock, Penelope L.

1967 "Self-Recruitment in the College Teaching Profession." Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, Center for the Study of Higher Education (Unpublished).

Carrell, William D.

1968 "American College Professors: 1750-1800." History of Education Quarterly 9 (Fall): 289-305.

Chronicle of Higher Education

1970 Vol. 4, No. 26, April 6.

Clark, Kenneth

1957 American Psychologists: A Growing Profession. American Psychological Association. Washington, D. C.

Donovan, John D.

1964 The Academic Man in the Catholic College. New York: Sheed & Ward.

Earnest, Ernest P.

1953 Academic Procession. Indianapolis: Dobbs-Merrill.

Goodloe, Abbe

1895 College Girls. New York: Charles Scribners.

Greeley, Andrew M.

1973 "The 'Religious Factor' and Academic Careers: Another Communication." American Journal of Sociological Analysis 32 (Winter): 215-228.

Gustad, John W.

1960 The Career Decisions of College Teachers. (SREB Research Monograph Series No. 2.) Atlanta, Georgia: Southern Regional Education Board (November).

Henlein, George A. and Robert T. Blackburn

1971 "Faculty Views on Identity and Professionalism for Catholic Colleges and Universities." Sociological Analysis 32 (Winter): 215-228.

Herrick, Robert

1925 Chimes. New York: The MacMillan Company.

Hofstadter, Richard and Wilson Smith

1962 American Higher Education: A Documentary History." Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Inglis, Ruth

1938 "An Objective Approach to Fictional Society." American Sociological Review III (August): 526-533.

Kennedy, Sister M. St. Mel.

1961 "The Changing Academic Characteristics of the Nineteenth-Century American College Teacher." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, St. Louis University.

King, Charles W.

1968 "Factors Related to Faculty Service in Church Colleges." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota.

King, James B.

1970 "The Persona of the Professor in the American College Novel, 1828-1968." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Michigan.

Kunkel, B. W.

1937 "A Survey of College Faculties." Bulletin of Association of American Colleges 23 (December): 249-514. Reprinted in condensed form in AAUP Bulletin 24 (March 1938): 249-262.

Lazersfeld, Paul F. and Wagner Thielens, Jr.

1958 The Academic Mind: Social Scientists in a Time of Crisis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Lenski, Gerhard

1961 The Religious Factor. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.

Lipset, Seymour M. and Everett C. Ladd, Jr.

1971 Jewish Academic in the United States: Their Achievements, Culture and Politics. Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lyons, John O.

1962 The College Novel in America. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

McCarthy, Mary

1951 The Groves of Academe. New York: The New American Library.

McKinney, Charles L.

1963 "Inter-Generational Mobility of Male Offspring of College Teachers." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Florida State University.

Metzger, Walter P.

1973 "Academic Tenure in America: A Historical Essay," in Academic Tenure. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass: 93-159.

Millgate, Michael

1964 American Social Fiction: James to Cozzens. New York: Barnes and Noble.

Parsons, Talcott and Gerald Platt

1968 The American Academic Profession: A Pilot Study. National Science Foundation Grant GS 513 (March).

Perkins, Dexter

1962 The Education of Historians in the United States. New York: MacMillan.

Pier, Arthur

1899 The Pedagogues: A Study of the Harvard Summer School. Boston: Small, Maynard.

Roe, Anne

1953 The Making of a Scientist. New York: Dodd, Mead.

Rudolph, Frederick

1962 The American College and University: A History. New York: Alfred A Knopf.

Shryrock, Richard H.

1959 The University of Pennsylvania Faculty: A Study of American Higher Education. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Stecklein, John E. and Ruth E. Eckert

1958 An Exploratory Study of Factors Influencing the Choice of College Teaching as a Career. Washington, D. C.: Cooperative Research Program, U.S. Office of Education (January).

Thalheimer, Fred

1963 Religiosity in the Academic Profession. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.

1973 "Religiosity and Secularization in the Academic Professions." Sociology of Education 46 (Spring): 183-202.

Trilling, Lionel

1950 "Manners, Morals and the Novel." The Liberal Imagination. New York: Viking Press.

Veysey, Laurence.

1966 The Emergence of the University, 1865-1915. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Visher, Stephen S.

1947 Scientists Starred 1903-1943. American Men in Science. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.

Wilson, Logan

1942 The Academic Man. London: Oxford University Press.

1965 "The Academic Man Revisited." Studies of College Faculty. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Zelan, Joseph

1968 "Religious Apostasy, Higher Education, and Occupational Choice." Sociology of Education 41: 370-379.